

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

February 2021

Institutional Digital Repositories: a systematic review of literature

Bijan Kumar Roy

University of Calcutta, Kolkata, bkroylis@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Roy, Bijan Kumar, "Institutional Digital Repositories: a systematic review of literature" (2021). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 4855.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/4855>

Institutional Digital Repositories: a systematic review of literature

Dr. Bijan Kumar Roy

Associate Professor, Department of Library & Information Science,
University of Calcutta, West Bengal, India
Email: bkroylis@gmail.com

Abstract

Institutional Digital Repositories (IDRs) throughout the World are at a critical point in their development. The barriers are multifaceted and derive from the different stakeholders such as organization, funding body, publishers, users, academicians, administrators, and the governmental policies. The problems that have been identified after reviewing existing literatures are basically three folds viz. technical (hardware, software, open standard), non-technical (administrative, policy issue) and cultural (social acceptance, advocacy and promotion etc). The main objective of the study is to discuss several key parameters that are required to be considered before developing institute-specific IDR. Here, the following four issues viz. advocacy and promotion, content recruitment, content quality, copyrights and licensing included in cultural part have been discussed.

Keywords: Open Access, Institutional Digital Repositories, Advocacy and Promotion, Self Archiving, Content Quality, Content Recruitment, Copyrights and Licensing

Advocacy and Promotion

Advocacy has become a crucial aspect of ‘Institutional Digital Repositories’ movement (Chan, Kwok & Yip, 2005) as it is relatively new concept to the academic community and majority of our users are unfamiliar with the concept. Continuous support and advocacy programme was found to be helpful in increasing awareness about IDR among the masses (Dill & Palmer, 2005; Morgan & Team IDR, 2006; Roy, 2015). Johnson (2008) has rightly said that ‘advocacy is a route to achieve the crucial goal, real cultural change’. A number of studies (Jones, Andrew & MacColl, 2006; Mackie, 2004; Markey et al., 2007; Bevan, 2007; Greig, 2004) have advocated several methods to populate IDR.

Awareness and advocacy activities can be of different formats such as seminars, webinars, brochures, leaflets etc (RECODE, 2014) and a number of strategies–could be used including top-down and bottom-up, blanket and targeted approaches to populate IDR (DRIVER, 2008). Several studies (Mark & Shearer, 2006; Horwood et al., 2004; Ashworth, Mackie & Nixon, 2004; Pinfield, Gardner & MacColl, 2002; Barton & Waters, 2004–2005) have reported a number of strategies (e.g. brochures, campus newsletters, campus newsletters/newspapers etc.) that existing IDRs have already used, or can use to encourage its acceptance and uptake. This study (Weenink, Waaijers & Godtsenhoven, 2007) suggested six good practices based on European context that influences the development of IDR.

Continued marketing and promotion leads to the continued growth of the IDR (Leary, Lundstrom & Martin, 2012), as IDR is considered as a product that needs to attract a market (Gierveld, 2006). It is well established that successful promotional efforts including aggressive marketing and value-added services can only increase faculty participation in IDR system (Troll Covey, 2011). It has been suggested by many studies (Shearer, 2003; Kim, 2006) that the success of IDRs will be determined eventually by their uptake and use by researchers. It is needed because there is a serious lack of visibility (McKay, 2007; Davis & Conolly, 2007) and usage (Kim, 2006; Woodland & Ng, 2006) among authors and information seekers. Another group of authors (Davis & Connelly, 2007; Watson, 2007) put emphasis on faculty attitudes, motivations, and behaviors for non-participation in IDR and encourage academic communities to deposit their work. It may be due to the fact that our academicians, researchers are not aware about the quality of contents (ALPSP, 2002; Bentum, 2001; Gonzalez & Porcel, 2007) as well as copyright and plagiarism issues (Suber, 2008; Abrizah, 2009). A study by Christian (2008) and Nwokedi (2011) revealed that the major barriers to the use of IR by the faculty in University of Lagos and University of Jos are lack of awareness or ignorance, fear of plagiarism, constant power failure, copyright issues, server unavailability and lack of time.

Several other experts (Aschenbrenner et al., 2008; Lynch, 2003; Thibodeau, 2007; Westell, 2006) put emphasis on collaboration and participation of stakeholders or community members to increase accessibility and usability of IDR. Bamigbola (2014) opined that “the use of IR is jointly determined by level of awareness and attitude.”

Pickton & McKnight (2006) put emphasis not only on academic staff but also on library staff who can help submitters in deposition process through the use of a system of ‘*mediated deposit*’. Kamraninia & Abrizah (2010) opined that librarians have not taken on the proper roles or developed the skills necessary to promote an IR. Armbruster (2011) also insisted librarians as well as other OA advocates to archive on behalf of the authors or to *assist depositors* or to introduce *mediated deposit*.

Markland & Brophy (2005) pointed out that IDR to be successful, cultural change must be achieved through advocacy or ‘getting the right message to the right people with the tone and contents varied by audience’ (Johnson, 2008). Some other experts (Hubbard, 2003; Ware, 2004) identified cultural rather than technological factors that limit the use and development of IDRs.

Some other experts have shared their practical experiences and discussed various attempts that they had adopted to populating repositories as well as encouraging faculties to participate in their own IDR such as at University of Oregon (Jenkins, Breakstone & Hixson, 2005); University of Melbourne (Horwood et al., 2004); University of Glasgow (Ashworth, Mackie & Nixon, 2004). For example, arranging incentives such as awarding prizes (Cullen & Chawner, 2008). Xia et al. (2012) showed how this strategy had become fruitful in University of Minho, Portugal in adding material to the repository. Peter Suber (Suber, 2008), one of the prominent OA advocate had suggested three principles viz. use of mandatory language regarding university expectations; faculty and staff education and assistance; and incentives to use the repository.

Covey (2011) points out the overall attitudes of faculty unwilling to accept IRs – and the concept of Open Access in general – as a lack of awareness, understanding, incentives or mandates; indifference; opposition to change; unwillingness to take risks; and a lack of adoption by others.

Content Recruitment

“Recruitment of content, not technology, is the greatest barrier to success” (Gibbons, 2004b) and is considered as the most vital issue for the development of IDR (Westrienen & Lynch, 2005). Jones (2007) rightly opined that building technological infrastructure is not hard but “deciding on what

content and preservation approaches are the matter of concern". The objective of establishing IR will be effective if there are sufficient resources and is accessible to users.

Several studies (Heery & Anderson, 2005; Davis & Connolly, 2007; Salo, 2008) have consistently reported that recruiting contents is a difficult task and has been enlisted by IDR staff (Crow 2002b; Chan, 2004; Shearer, 2004, 2005; Mackie, 2004; Barton & Waters, 2004–2005; Jenkins, Breakstone & Hixson, 2005; Graham, Skaggs & Stevens, 2005; Chan, Kwok & Yip, 2005; Bell, Foster & Gibbons, 2005). Some other studies (Westell, 2006; Sale, 2006a; Jingfeng, 2006; Kingsley, 2008) have raised several questions and issues such as mandate; integration with planning; funding model; relationship with digitization centers; interoperability; measurement; promotion; and preservation strategy, personal name identification etc. relating to this issue.

Several studies have already proposed different motivating strategies such as devising collection development policy (Genoni, 2004; Pettijohn & Neville, 2003); research publication system (Feijen et al., 2007); making the deposit of articles appear fun and attractive, self-archiving mandates, and providing services (Giesecke, 2011); and values of librarianship; collecting and preserving an institution's scholarship (Bailey et al., 2006a).

Carr & Brody (2007) stated that the key to a successful repository is sustained deposits and the success depends on contributions from the faculties, researchers, yet not all faculties contribute to repositories in the institution (Casey, 2012). But faculty's lack of understanding of the IDR (Davis & Connolly, 2007; Foster & Gibbons, 2005; Rieh et al., 2007b), limited technical skill and lack of additional time to deposit research articles (Xia et al., 2012) into IDR are considered as the key problems of recruiting contents. Self-deposition or self-submission by depositors is also considered as another barrier to content recruitment because faculties feel it overworked and thus not widely adopted (Walters, 2007). To solve this problem, Exline (2016) suggested mediated deposit (by library staff) because it works better in acquiring content to IR.

To achieve sustained deposits, community engagement is essential (Henty, 2007). Jenkins, Breakstone & Hixson (2005) described recruitment approaches through creation of user communities by the librarian. Many authors have advocated for mandates as a solution for the slow population of IRs (Pinfield, 2005; Jones et al., 2006; Thiede, 2014).

Another group of authors (Hassen, 2006; Mark & Shearer, 2006; Kim, 2006) have suggested several others recruitment strategies including accessibility, publicity, professional recognition, contents harvesting, usage, feedback etc. for an IDR. The other studies (ALPSP, 2002; Bentum, 2001; Gonzalez & Porcel, 2007) concluded that the process of recruiting content depends on quality of contents.

Davis & Connolly (2007) concluded that use of IDR by faculties depend on disciplinary cultures and reward structures while Foster & Gibbons (2005) mentioned three ways (deposit process, created researcher pages for faculty, promoting IR in the faculty's language etc.) of promoting contents of IDR. Aggressive marketing (Troll Covey, 2011) and providing value-added services are necessary to increase faculty participation (Bankier & Perciali, 2008) in IDR. Giesecke (2011) reported that arranging additional incentives to the depositors may be helpful in acquiring content into IDR.

Content Quality

The accessibility and usability of an IR solely depends on quality of content because contents are considered as the most important factor to show the success of a repository (Macha & de Jager, 2011). But still quality of contents is a low-prioritized aspect of digital libraries and digital

repositories as all public funded research results or peer reviewed reports are not of high quality especially where pre-prints are concerned (Kling & McKim, 1999). It has become a great issue for most academicians including researchers as most of the readers want high quality, peer reviewed articles in their domain (Swan & Brown, 2003). This uncertainty presents another obstacle to faculty participation in IRs, as authors give importance only on peer view quality articles (ALPSP, 2002; Bentum, 2001). So, guaranteeing the quality of the contents is important to win the willingness of the authors and to achieve the intended outer institutional visibility (Gonzalez & Porcel, 2007). But, academicians generally authors are not well aware about the quality issue and do not consider it as an important issue (ALPSP, 2002; Bentum, 2001; Gonzalez & Porcel, 2007).

Establishing quality assurance and control strategies are important not only for the trustworthiness of IR resources but also for re-use and long-term preservation of research data (RECODE, 2014) and quality management systems are needed to define processes for the production and management of data and metadata (RLG & NARA, 2005). There are different grades of perceived content quality. Several authors (Robertson, 2005; Ochoa & Duval, 2009; Park, 2009) put emphasis on quality of metadata because low-quality metadata compromise the effectiveness of services that repositories provide to their users. Jones (2007) reported that validation and verification of the data can be done in two levels viz. the metadata about a particular scholarly work and the organizational and contextual information about the work. Roy (2015) proposed two ways viz. quality of the metadata and quality of file formats. Another study put emphasis on validity and authenticity of the submitted item and concluded that it is the responsibility of the content contributors, and is not checked by the repository (SHERPA, 2007). Another study put emphasis on quality of documentation as one of the evaluative criteria for any repository and this difficult issue should be made by individual institution and not mandated by international standards (Genoni, 2004).

Crow (2002a) recommended for differentiating between pre-prints and published peer-reviewed research. Pinfield & James (2003) proposed a mechanism for clear labeling of pre- and post-prints version into two separate sections or in separate areas of the site. Proberts & Jenkins (2006) supports this view and suggested to segregate pre- and post-prints into separate repositories. Harnad (2003) recommended that work should be submitted to a refereed journal, and then the post-print should be self-archived in a digital repository.

Measuring content quality is a vital issue and should be assessed by experts and colleagues in the field concerned (Green, Macdonald & Rice, 2009). Kling, Spector & McKim (2002) argued that reputation of the respective department (in case of non-peer view articles) ensures the quality of the documents. Wang & Wang (2012) put emphasis on selection of persons or experts with corresponding background knowledge to review the achievements submitted by researchers. Lee, Goh & Chua (2010) suggested that it could be done by the knowledge management expert within the institution using a standardized checklist tool. Even, it may be reviewed by the Dean or Head of the Department (<http://www.lib.unimelb.edu.au/eprints/collectionpolicy.htm>). Day (2003) argued that as focus of an IR is on contents (peer-reviewed or not), the choice being left to those who develop their collection policies.

Copyrights and Licensing

Copyright remains the biggest obstacle in self-archiving articles in IR (Gadd, Oppenheim & Proberts 2003a, 2003b; Chan, 2004; Allen, 2005; Foster & Gibbons, 2005; Abrizah, 2009; Stanton & Liew, 2012). Several authors (Harnad, 1999; Van Orsdel & Born, 2005) emphasized that one of the rights that authors should seriously consider retaining is the right to self-archive. But authors are not always aware of the full copyright implications of their work (Swan & Brown, 2005) and had fewer concerns over the use and potential abuse of their work (i.e. plagiarism, integrity and commercial use) (Gadd, Oppenheim & Proberts, 2003c). However, most authors are afraid of breaching

copyright and do not want to devote time to review the publishing conditions imposed by publishers (Bírsan et al., 2014).

The first RoMEO (Rights Metadata for Open Archiving) survey results showed that only 3 percent of authors insisted on retaining copyright, with 49 percent assigning copyright to publishers reluctantly, 41 percent assigning it freely, and 7 percent indicating that publishers did not retain copyright (Gadd, Proberts & Oppenheim, 2003a). They concluded that 90% of the authors still assign copyright in exchange for publication, with 50% doing so reluctantly. In another report (Rowlands, Nicholas, & Huntingdon, 2004), it was found that only 13 percent of authors took a “detailed interest,” and 46 percent took no interest in copyright. Swan & Brown (2005), after surveying 1296 authors reported that 22 percent did not know who retained copyright, 35 percent reported that they retained copyright, 37 percent said that the publisher was the copyright holder, and 6 percent indicated another party as the copyright holder. Another study (Hoorn & van der Graaf, 2006) reported that 71% prefer to keep copyright, 2% prefer to transfer copyright to publishers, 23% are neutral about the choice between the two, and 4% do not know.

This is due to the fact that authors are not aware of conditions of copyright or copyright transfer agreements and several authors (Swan & Brown, 2005; Relman, 1981; Angell & Kassirer, 1991; Gadd, Proberts & Oppenheim, 2003b; Antelman, 2006) have focused on creating awareness of self-archiving and licensing policies.

RECODE (2014) reported that researchers and institutions have already adopted strategies and measures to address potential legal and ethical issues, such as access control mechanisms, licensing and ‘soft law’ measures, and many of these strategies are used to address both legal and ethical issues. Another study (Weenink, Waaijers & Godtsenhoven, 2007; Joint, 2006a) outlined some useful insights into how to manage copyright and other intellectual rights aspects of digital library collections relevant for digital repositories development. Lynch (1994) suggested solutions like dedicated server, document digest algorithms, and cryptographic signatures to overcome some of these problems. Another project “A guide to developing open access through your digital repository” covers important issues (e.g. licensing, technical considerations such as software and metadata) relating to copy right and provides valuable directions to the repository managers (Pappalardo & Fitzgerald, 2007). This report contains important sections that discuss pre-prints and post-prints and copyright issues.

Hoorn (2005) put emphasis on and considers ways librarians can support scholars in managing the demands of copyright so as to respond to the needs of scholarly communication. A survey report (Hanlon & Ramirez, 2011)) of IRs managers indicated that a majority of IRs follow a mediated deposit process, with librarians and library staff holding the role of copyright clearance. The other authors (Besek et al., 2008) reviewed current copy right and related laws and their impact on preservation.

Another report (ALPSP, 2002) suggested that authors and faculties are now aware of the IPR issues and they consider it important to retain copyright with them. They don’t want their materials to be used by others and want to keep self-archiving rights and rights for personal educational use with them (Kling & McKim, 2000; Bennett, 1999). Gadd, Oppenheim & Proberts (2003d, 2003e) adocated that material placed in an IR should be owned by the institution, the author or, in the case of a post print, a publisher. A number of model authors’ addenda have been proposed for use by authors to ensure that they retain the right to deposit and reuse their research articles (Roy, Biswas & Mukhopadhyay, 2017). Another group of authors (Gadd, Oppenheim & Proberts, 2004; Xia et al., 2012; Pujar, 2014) have recommended the use of Creative Commons (CC) license to express the rights attached to individual research papers.

References

- Abrizah, A. (2009). Faculty's awareness, self-archiving experience and contribution to university's Institutional repository. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 14(2). Unpublished manuscript.
- Allen, J. (2005). *Interdisciplinary differences in attitudes towards deposit in institutional repositories*. Unpublished master's thesis, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK. Retrieved July 2, 2017, from <http://eprints.rclis.org/6957/>
- ALPSP. (2004). *Authors and electronic publishing: the ALPSP research study on authors' and readers' views of electronic research communication*. Worthing, West Sussex: The Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers.
- Angell, M., & Kassirer, J.P. (1991). The Ingelfinger rule revisited. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 325, 1371-1373. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199111073251910
- Antelman, K. (2006). Self-archiving practice and the influence of publisher policies in the social sciences. *Learned Publishing*, 19(2), 85-95.
- Armbruster, C. (2011). Open access policy implementation: first results compared. *Learned Publishing*, 24(4), 311-324. doi:10.1087/20110409
- Aschenbrenner, A., et al. (2008). The Future of Repositories? Patterns for (Cross-) Repository Architectures. *D-Lib Magazine*, 14(11/12). Retrieved July 22, 2016, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november08/aschenbrenner/11aschenbrenner.html>.
- Ashworth, S., Mackie, M., & Nixon, W. J. (2004). The DAEDALUS Project, Developing institutional repositories at Glasgow University: The story so far. *Library Review*, 53(5), 259-264.
- Bailey, C. W., et al. (2006a). *Institutional Repositories SPEC kit 292*. Washington, D. C: Association of Research Libraries.
- Bamigbola, A. (2014). Surveying attitude and use of institutional repositories (IRs) by faculty in agriculture disciplines: a case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 147, 505-509. Retrieved April 25, 2017, from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042814040567
- Bankier, J., & Perciali, I. (2008). The institutional repository rediscovered: What can a university do for open access publishing? *Serials Review*, 34(1), 21-26.
- Barton, M. R., & Waters, M. M. (2004-2005). *Creating an institutional repository: LEADIRS Workbook*. Cambridge, M. A: MIT.
- Bell, S., Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Reference librarians and the success of institutional repositories. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 283-290.
- Bentum, M. V. (2001). *Attitude of Academic Staff and [Research] Managers to Electronic Publishing and the Use of Distributed Document Servers on University Level: A Survey Report*. ARNO Report, Work Package 7. Retrieved April 25, 2015, from <http://www.docin.com/p-55585243.html>
- Bennett, S. (1999). Authors' Rights. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 5(2). Retrieved February 7, 2016, from <http://www.press.umich.edu/jep/05-02/bennett.html>
- Besek, J. M., et al. (2008). Digital Preservation and Copyright: An International Study. *The International Journal of Digital Curation*, 3(2), 103-111.
- Bevan, S. J. (2007). Developing an institutional repository: Cranfield QUEprints – a case study. *OCLC Systems & Services: International digital library perspectives*, 23(2), 170-182.
- Birsan, I., et al. (2014). Integration of open source systems for visibility of scientific production of universities. *Advances in Information Science and Applications-Volume I, Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Computers* (July 17-21, 2014, Santorini Island, Greece)

- (pp. 173-176). Retrieved June 12, 2017, from <http://www.inase.org/library/2014/santorini/COMPUTERS1.pdf>
- Carr, L., & Brody, T. (2007). Size isn't everything: Sustainable repositories as evidenced by sustainable deposit profiles. *D-Lib Magazine*, 13(7/8). Retrieved October 10, 2016, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july07/carr/07carr.html>
- Casey, A.M. (2012). Does tenure matter? Factors influencing Faculty contributions to Institutional repositories. *Journal of Librarianship and scholarly communication*, 1(1). eP1032. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1032>
- Chan, L. (2004). Supporting and enhancing scholarship in the Digital Age: The role of open-access institutional repositories. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 29, 277-300.
- Chan, D. L. H., Kwok, C. S. Y., & Yip, S. K. F. (2005). Changing roles of reference librarians: The case of the HKUST Institutional Repository. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 268-282.
- Christian, G.E. (2008). *Issues and challenges to the development of open access institutional repositories in academic and research institutions in Nigeria*. Retrieved June 22, 2017, from <http://idl-bnc.idrc.ca/dspace/bitstream/10625/36986/1/127792.pdf>
- Covey, D.T. (2011). Recruiting content for the institutional repository: the barriers exceed the benefits. *Journal of Digital Information*, 12(3), pp. 1-18.
- Crow, R. (2002a). *The Case for Institutional Repositories: A SPARC Position Paper*. Washington, D. C: The Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition.
- Crow, R. (2002b). *SPARC Institutional Repository Checklist & Resource Guide*. Washington, D. C: The Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition.
- Cullen, R., & Chawner, B. (2008). Institutional repositories in New Zealand: comparing institutional strategies for digital preservation and discovery. *Digital Discovery: Strategies and Solutions. Proceedings of the 29th Annual IATUL Conferences* (April 21-24, 2008, AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand. Paper 18. Retrieved June 22, 2015, from <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/iatul/2008/papers/18>
- Cullen, R., & Chawner, B. (2011). Institutional repositories, open access, and scholarly communication: A study of conflicting paradigms. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 37(6), 460-470. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2011.07.002
- Day, M. (2003). *Prospects for institutional e-print repositories in the United Kingdom: ePrints UK supporting study*. No. 1. Version 1.0. Retrieved February 17, 2015, from <http://eprints-k.rdn.ac.uk/project/docs/studies/impact/>
- Davis, P., & Connelly, M. J. L. (2007). Institutional Repositories, Evaluating the Reasons for Non-use of Cornell University's Installation of DSpace. *D-Lib Magazine*, 13(3/4). Retrieved July 17, 2017, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march07/davis/03davis.html>
- Dill, E., & Palmer, K. L. (2005). What's the big IDEa? Considerations for implementing an institutional repository. *Library Hi Tech News*, 22(6), 11-14.
- DRIVER. (2008). *DRIVER-Digital Repository Infrastructure Vision for European Research: In Information for institutional staff*. Retrieved 10 April, 2015, from <http://www.driver-support.eu/personnel.html>
- Exline, E. (2016). Extending the institutional repository to include undergraduate research. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 23(1), pp. 16-27. doi: 10.1080/10691316.2014.950782.
- Feijen, M., et al. (2007). DRIVER: Building the network for accessing digital repositories across Europe. *Ariadne*, 53. Retrieved March 5, 2017, from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue53/feijen-et-al/>
- Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Understanding Faculty to Improve Content Recruitment for Institutional Repositories. *D-Lib Magazine* 11(1). Retrieved May 10, 2017, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html>
- Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., & Probets, S. (2003a). RoMEO studies 1: The impact of copyright ownership on author-self-archiving. *Journal of Documentation*, 59(3), 243-277.

- Gadd, E., Proberts, S., & Oppenheim, C. (2003b). RoMEO Studies 2: How Academics Want to Protect Their Open-Access Research Papers. *Journal of Information Science*, 29(5), 333–356.
- Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., & Proberts, S. (2003c). RoMEO Studies 3: how academics expect to use open-access research papers. *Journal of Library and Information Science*, 35(3), 171-187.
- Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., & Proberts, S. (2003d, Winter). Self-Archiving: The Right Thing? An Introduction to the RoMEO Project. *SCONUL Newsletter*, 27, 34–37.
- Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., & Proberts, S. (2003e). The intellectual property rights issues facing self-archiving. Key findings of the RoMEO Project. *D-Lib Magazine*, 9(9). Retrieved August 21, 2017, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september03/gadd/09gadd.html>
- Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., & Proberts, S. (2004). RoMEO studies 6: rights metadata for open archiving. *Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 38(1), 5-14.
- Gibbons, S. (2004b). Benefits of an institutional repository, *Library Technology Reports*, 40(4), 11-16.
- Giesecke, J. (2011). Institutional repositories: Keys to success. *Journal of Library Administration*, 51(5/6), 529-542.
- Gierveld, H. (2006). Considering a Marketing and Communications Approach for an Institutional Repository. *Ariadne*, 49. Retrieved August 7, 2017, from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue49/gierveld/>
- Gonzalez, A. B., & Porcel, A. F. (2007). *Guidelines for the Creation of Institutional Repositories at Universities and Higher Education Organisations*. Valparaiso: ALFA Network Babel Library.
- Graham, J. B., Skaggs, B. L., & Stevens, K. W. (2005). Digitizing a gap: a state-wide institutional repository project. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 337-345.
- Green, A., Macdonald, S., & Rice, R. (2009). *Policy making for research data in repositories: a guide*. Retrieved February 5, 2017, from <http://www.disc-uk.org/docs/guide.pdf>
- Greig, M. (2004). The copyright conundrum: How to populate your repository and stay legal. Paper presented at the *SPARC Europe workshop on Institutional repositories: the next stage* (November 18-19, 2004, University of Glasgow, Washington D.C). Washington, D. C: SPARC. Retrieved July 8, 2015, from <https://dspace.gla.ac.uk/bitstream/1905/311/1/greig.ppt>
- Hanlon, A., & Ramirez, M. (2011). Asking for permission: A survey of copyright workflows for institutional repositories. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 11(2), 683-702.
- Harnad, S. (2003). Open access to peer-reviewed research through author/institution self archiving: maximising research impact by maximising online access. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine*, 49(4), 337-342.
- Harnad, S. (1999). Free at last: The future of peer-reviewed journals. *D-Lib Magazine*, 5(12). Retrieved July 15, 2016, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/december99/12harnad.html>.
- Hassen, M. (2006). Content recruitment and development: A proactive approach to building an institutional repository. *Annual Conference of the EDUCAUSE* (October 9 -12, 2006, Dallas, Podcast) (pp. 1-10). Dallas: EDUCAUSE.
- Heery, R., & Anderson, S. (2005). *Digital Repositories Review*. UKOLN and AHDS Report. Bath, United Kingdom: UKOLN. Retrieved July 7, 2016, from http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/digital-repositories-review-2005.pdf
- Hoorn, E. (2005). Repositories, Copyright and Creative Commons for Scholarly Communication. *Ariadne*, 45. Retrieved March 22, 2016, from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue45/hoorn/intro.html>
- Hoorn, E., & van der Graaf, M. (2006). Copyright Issues in Open Access Research Journals. *D-Lib Magazine*, 12(2). Retrieved May 12, 2009, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/february06/vandergraaf/02vandergraaf.html>.
- Horwood, L., et al. (2004). OAI Compliant Institutional Repositories and the Role of Library Staff. *Library Management*, 25(4/5), 170-176.

- Hubbard, B. (2003). SHERPA and Institutional Repositories. *Serials*, 16(3), 243–247.
- Jenkins, B., Breakstone, E., & Hixson, C. (2005). Content in, content out: The dual roles of the reference librarian in institutional repositories. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 312-324.
- Jingfeng, X. (2006). Personal name identification in the practice of digital repositories. *Program: Electronic Library & Information Systems*, 40(3), 256-267.
- Johnson, G. J. (2008). In the kingdom of the blind: successfully implementing institutional repositories in the United Kingdom and the Sherpa partnership experience. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 13(1-2), 13-33.
- Joint, N. (2006a). Risk assessment and copyright in digital libraries. *Library Review*, 55(9), 545-548.
- Jones, C. (2007). *Institutional repositories: content and culture in an open access environment*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Jones, R., Andrew, T., & MacColl, J. (2006). *The Institutional Repository*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Kamraninia, K., & Abrizah, A. (2010). *Librarians' role in the institutional repository phenomenon: a case of Malaysian academic libraries*. Retrieved January 17, 2018, from http://repository.um.edu.my/8351/1/P13T3_KATAYOON_MSIA.pdf
- Kim, J. (2006). Motivating and impeding factors affecting faculty contribution to institutional repositories. Paper presented at the *Joint Conference on Digital Libraries* (June 11-15, 2006, Chapel Hill, NC, USA). USA: ACM. Retrieved June 17, 2016, from <http://www.ils.unc.edu/tibbo/JCDL2006/Kim-JCDLWorkshop2006.pdf>.
- Kingsley, D. (2008). Repositories, research and reporting: the conflict between institutional and disciplinary needs. Paper presented at *VALA conference* (February 5-7, 2008, Melbourne Convention Centre, Australia). Retrieved March 22, 2015, from http://www.valaconf.org.au/vala2008/papers2008/117_Kingsley_Final.pdf
- Kling, R., & McKim, G. (1999). Scholarly Communication and the Continuum of Electronic Publishing. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(10), 890-906.
- Kling, R., & McKim, G. (2000). Not Just a Matter of Time: Field Differences and the Shaping of Electronic Media in Supporting Scientific Communication. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(14), 1306 -1320.
- Kling, R., Spector, L., & McKim, G. (2002). Locally controlled scholarly publishing via the Internet: The guild model. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 8(1). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0008.101>
- Leary, H., Lundstrom, K., & Martin, P. (2012). Copyright solutions for institutional repositories: A collaboration with subject librarians. *Journal of Library Innovation*, 3(1), 101-110.
- Lee, C. S., Goh, D. H., & Chua, A. (2010). An analysis of knowledge management mechanisms in healthcare portals. *J Librariansh Inf Sci*, 42(1), 20–44.
- Lynch, C. A. (2003). *Institutional repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the Digital Age*. ARL Bimonthly Report, No. 226, pp. 1-7. Retrieved May 22, 2016, from <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/br/br226/br226ir.shtml>
- Lynch, C. A. (1994). The integrity of digital information, mechanics and definitional issues. *Journal of the American Society of Information Science*, 45(10), 737-744.
- Macha, A., & de Jager, K. (2011). A comparative overview of the development of the institutional repositories at the University of Cape Town and at the University of Pretoria'. *Proceedings of 14th International Symposium on Electronic Theses and Dissertations* (September 13-17, 2011, Cape Town, South Africa). USA: NDLTD. Retrieved May 11, 2015, from http://dl.cs.uct.ac.za/conferences/etd2011/papers/etd2011_macha.pdf
- Mackie, M. (2004). Filling Institutional Repositories: Practical Strategies from the DAEDALUS Project. *Ariadne*, 39. Retrieved May 11, 2016, from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie/>
- Mark, T., & Shearer, K. (2006). Institutional repositories: A review of content recruitment strategies. *World Library and Information Congress: 72nd IFLA General Conference and Council*

- (August 20-24, 2006, Seoul, Korea) (pp. 1 – 10). Hague: IFLA. Retrieved August 12, 2016, from http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf
- Markey, K., et al. (2007). *Census of Institutional Repositories in the United States: MIRACLE Project Research Findings*. Washington D. C: Council on Library and Information Resources. Retrieved March 22, 2016, from <http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub140abst.html>
- Markland, M., & Brophy, P. (2005). *SHERPA project evaluation: final report*. Manchester: Centre for Research in Library & Information Management. Retrieved March 10, 2016, from http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/SHERPA_Evaluation.pdf
- McKay, D. (2007). Institutional Repositories and Their 'Other' Users: Usability Beyond Authors. *Ariadne*, 52. Retrieved March 11, 2016, from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue52/mckay>
- Morgan, E. L., & Team IDR. (2006). *Institutional Digital Repository*. Final Report. Phase I. Retrieved March 20, 2016, from <http://www.library.nd.edu/idr/documents/idr-final-report.pdf>
- Nwokedi (2011). Nigerian university academics and institutional repository: a case study of University of Jos, Faculty of Natural Sciences Lecturers. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology*, 7(2), 137-146.
- Ochoa, X., & Duval, E. (2009). Automatic evaluation of metadata quality in digital repositories. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*, 10(2/3), 67-91.
- Pappalardo, K., & Fitzgerald, A. (2007). *A Guide to Developing Open Access Through Your Digital Repository*. Version 2. Retrieved July 13, 2017, from <http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au/files/OAK%20Law%20Project%20Repository%20Guide.pdf>
- Park, J. (2009). Metadata Quality in Digital Repositories: A Survey of the Current State of the Art. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 47(3/4), 213–228.
- Pettijohn, P., & Neville, T. (2003). Collection development for virtual libraries. In Ardis Hanson & Bruce Lubotsky Levin (Eds.), *Building a virtual library* (pp. 20-36). Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
- Pickton, M., & McKnight, C. (2006). Research students and the Loughborough institutional repository. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 38(4), 203-219.
- Pinfield, S. (2005). A mandate to self archive? The role of open access institutional repositories. *Serials Librarian*, 18(1), 30-34.
- Pinfield, S., Gardner, M., & MacColl, J. (2002). Setting up an institutional e-print archive. *Ariadne*, 31. Retrieved from May 12, 2016, from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue31/eprint-archives/>
- Pinfield, S., & James, H. (2003). The Digital Preservation of e-Prints. *D-Lib Magazine*, 9(9). Retrieved from March 22, 2016, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september03/pinfield/09pinfield.html>
- Proberts, S., & Jenkins, C. (2006). Documentation for Institutional Repositories. *Learned Publishing*, 19(1), 57–71.
- Pujar, S. M. (2014). Open access journals in library and information science: a study. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 61(3), 199-202.
- RECODE. (2014). *Policy recommendations for open access to research data*. Retrieved June 22, 2015, from www.recodeproject.eu
- Relman, A. S. (1981). The Ingelfinger Rule. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 305, 824-826. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM198110013051408
- Rieh, S. Y., et al. (2007b). *Census of Institutional Repositories in the United States: MIRACLE Project Research Findings*. USA: Council on Library and Information Resources. Retrieved February 10, 2016, from <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub140/pub140.pdf>
- RLG & NARA. (2005). *An audit checklist for the certification of trusted digital repositories*. Retrieved June 14, 2007, from <http://www.rlg.org/en/pdfs/rlgnara-repositorieschecklist.pdf>
- Robertson, R. J. (2005). Metadata quality: implications for library and information science professionals. *Library Review*, 54(5), 295–300.

- Rowlands, I., Nicholas, D., & Huntingdon, P. (2004). *Scholarly Communication in the Digital Environment: What Do Authors Want? Findings of an International Survey of Author Opinion*. Retrieved April, 2016, from [http://www.publishers.org.uk/paweb/paweb.nsf/0/b93e724b16fbc7f880256ea9003b77ae/\\$FILE/ciber-pa-report.pdf](http://www.publishers.org.uk/paweb/paweb.nsf/0/b93e724b16fbc7f880256ea9003b77ae/$FILE/ciber-pa-report.pdf)
- Roy, B. K., Biswas, S. C., & Mukhopadhyay, P. (2017). The COAPI cats: the current state of open access repository movement and policy documentations. *International Journal of Knowledge Content Development & Technology*, 6(1), 69-84.
- Roy, B. K. (2015). Institutional digital repository: From policy to practice. Germany: LAP.
- Sale, A. (2006a). Comparison of IR content policies in Australia. *First Monday*, 11(4). Retrieved April, 2016, from http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue11_4/sale/
- Salo, D. (2008). Innkeeper at the Roach Motel. *Library Trends*, 57(2), 98-123.
- Shearer, K. (2004). *Survey Results—Summer 2004: CARL Institutional Repositories Project*. Retrieved March 13, 2016, from http://www.carl-abrc.ca/projects/institutional_repositories/pdf/survey_results_2004-e.pdf.
- Shearer, K. (2005). *Institutional Repositories: The Evolution of Scholarly Communication*. Retrieved April 30, 2009, from http://www.carl-abrc.ca/projects/institutional_repositories/ppt/CACUL2-Apr05.ppt
- Shearer, M. K. (2003). Institutional repositories: towards the identification of critical success factors. *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 27(3), 89-108.
- SHERPA. (2007). *OpenDOAR Policies Tool*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham. Retrieved March 22, 2011, from <http://www.opendoar.org/tools/en/policies.php>
- Stanton, K. V., & Liew, C. L. (2012). Open access theses in institutional repositories: An exploratory study of the perceptions of doctoral students. *Information Research*, 17(1). Paper 507. Retrieved March 12, 2017, from <http://InformationR.net/ir/17-1/paper507.html>.
- Suber, P. (2008). Three Principles for University Open Access Policies. *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, 120. Retrieved April, 20, 2011, from <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/04-02-08.htm#principles>
- Swan, A., & Brown, S. (2003). Authors and electronic publishing: what authors want from the new technology. *Learned Publishing*, 16(1), 28-33.
- Swan, A., & Brown, S. (2005). *Open Access Self-Archiving: An Author Study*. Technical Report (pp. 1-104). U. K: Key Perspectives Ltd. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://cogprints.org/4385/1/jisc2.pdf>
- Thibodeau, K. (2007). If you build it, will it fly? Criteria for success in a digital repository. *Journal of Digital Information*. 8(2). Retrieved March 12, 2012 from <http://journals.tdl.org/jodi/index.php/jodi/article/viewArticle/197/174>
- Thiede, M. (2014). On open access evangelism. *Serials Librarian*, 67(1), 21-26. doi:10.1080/0361526X.2014.915608.
- Troll Covey, D. (2011). Recruiting content for the institutional repository: The barriers exceed the benefits. *University Libraries Research*. Paper 82. Retrieved April 10, 2012, from http://repository.cmu.edu/lib_science/82
- Van Orsdel, L. C., & Born, K. (2005). Choosing Sides. *Library Journal*, 30(7), 43-48.
- Walters, T. (2007). Reinventing the library – How repositories are causing librarians to rethink their professional roles. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 7(2), 213-225. doi: 10.1353/pla.2007.0023.
- Wang, X., & Wang, Y. (2012). *Study on Construction of University Institutional Repository*. Retrieved May, 2012, from <http://www.academicpub.org/essr/download.aspx?ID=111>
- Ware, M. (2004). *Publisher and Library/Learning Solutions (PALS): Pathfinder Research on Web-Based Repositories: Final Report*. Bristol: Mark Ware Consulting Ltd. Retrieved August 15, 2010, from <http://www.palsgroup.org.uk>
- Watson, S. (2007). Authors' attitudes to, and awareness and use of, a university institutional repository. *Serials*, 20(3), 225-230.

- Weenink, K., Waaijers, L., & Godtsenhoven, K. V. (Eds.) (2007). *A DRIVER's Guide to European Repositories: Five studies of important Digital Repository related issues and good Practices*. Retrieved August 5, 2010, from <http://dare.uva.nl/document/93898>
- Westell, M. (2006). Institutional Repositories: Proposed Indicators of Success. *Library Hi Tech*, 24(2), 211–226.
- Westrienen, G., & Lynch, C. A. (2005). Academic Institutional Repositories: Deployment Status in 13 Nations as of Mid 2005. *D-Lib Magazine*, 11(9). Retrieved September 18, 2006, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september05/westrienen/09westrienen.html>
- Woodland, J., & Ng, J. (2006). Too many systems, too little time: Integrating an ePrint repository into a University publications system. Paper presented at the *13th Biennial Conference and Exhibition of VALA* (February 8-10, 2006, Crown Towers, Melbourne). Australia: Victorian Association for Library Automation. Retrieved June 22, 2010, from http://www.valaconf.org.au/vala2006/papers2006/61_Woodland_Final.pdf
- Xia, J. (2007). Assessment of self-archiving in institutional repositories: Across disciplines. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 33(6), 647-654. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2007.09.020
- Xia, J., et al. (2012). A Review of Open Access Self-Archiving Mandate Policies. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 12(1), 85–102.